REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a preliminary response for the RCE filed on evendate herewith. It is responsive to the Office Action of February 23, 2006, that Office Action was made final. The period of response has been extended by three (3) months to August 23, 2006 by the enclosed Petition for Extension of Time.

In that Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-11. Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck, Jr. et al. (5,632,748).

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were amended to correct informalities.

The rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck, Jr. et al. (5,632,748) is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' present invention is directed toward a novel method of performing an ACL reconstruction surgical procedure. Beck, Jr. et al., either alone nor in combination with any other reference, do not suggest or disclose Applicants' novel method. The Examiner has pointed to no teaching or reference that speaks to the desirability of combining the reference cited by the Examiner (i.e., Beck, Jr. et al.) with any other disclosure. The Examiner has not pointed to a combination of references that would produce Applicants' claimed invention. Indeed, Beck et al. do not disclose or suggest Applicants' novel ACL reconstruction method using Applicants' novel biodegradable interference screws, wherein the method has surprising and unexpected results and benefits to the patient. Beck, Jr. et al. teach away from Applicants' claimed invention. In contrast to Beck et al., Applicants provide a composite interference screw containing biodegradable polymers in combination with bioceramics. Beck et al. broadly disclose biodegradable materials, but do not discuss the desirability of bioceramics. As recited in the Applicants' Specification and examples, and as further illustrated in Applicants' Figures, the Applicants' novel method using their novel biodegradable composite interference screws containing bioceramics has, surprisingly and

unexpectedly, improved bioabsorption and bone replacement, improved tissue in-growth and minimized tissue trauma. In further contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Beck et al. disclose a two-element anchoring system including at least one anchor element and a screw-type element. There is no indication that Beck et al. could be effective without the anchor element. Applicants' claimed method does not utilize an anchor member. Applicants' novel method utilizes a novel composite biodegradable interference screw.

Therefore, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection and allow the claims of record.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Donnelly et al.

By: /E. Richard Skula, Reg. No. 31,061/
E. Richard Skula
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,061

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
(732) 524-2718
Dated: August 4, 2006
Docket No. MIT5021USANP